



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,109	07/24/2001	Yoshifumi Sakamoto	JP920000036US1	4474
54856	7590	05/29/2007		
LOUIS PAUL HERZBERG 3 CLOVERDALE LANE MONSEY, NY 10952			EXAMINER HUYNH, SON P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/912,109

Applicant(s)

SAKAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Son P. Huynh

Art Unit

2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 03 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


SCOTT E. BELIVEAU
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendments to the claims such as "...by comparing a position coordinate of the cursor with coordinates of points included in area links linked to other web pages and the like" in independent claims 1, 8, 16 or "decoding" in claim 4 require further consideration and/or search.

In response to applicant's argument, "Tanigawa uses a Web browser over and over. Tanigawa is not concerned with a browserless technique. See for example, Tanigawa col. 9, lines 23 and 25, Tanigawa col. 28, line 66, and Tanigawa col. 23, lines 7-13 reads: the processes presented by these tags can be performed in the same way as a conventional browser...." (page 10-page 12), the Examiner respectfully traversed.

The web browser in col. 9, lines 21-25 is in prior art section. Tanigawa discussed about conventional browser in order to compare with the invention or to highlight the advantage of his invention: Tanigawa discloses the processes represented by these tags can be performed in the same way as a conventional browser (col. 23, lines 7-9). Tanigawa does not disclose or indicate the tags can be performed by a conventional browser. Particularly, Tanigawa discloses the present embodiment describes the case when in order to display WWW home pages on the Internet, the data communication system 100 uses a one to many TV broadcast to is perform simulated **bidirectional** communication, so that when compared to the case when home pages are displayed by a web browser on a personal computer... (col. 28, lines 62-67), and the advantage of the Tanigawa's invention over the use of conventional browser is "the display of the

user's desired pages on the display unit can be performed at a high speed which is unaffected by congestion. Since display image information is sent in a conventional TV format, the display of full color, high-resolution images can easily be achieved by the display unit, make full use of the component (while the display or display images generated by a browser for display on a TV monitor does not make full use of the component) – col. 28, line 66-col. 29, line 11. Thus, Tanigawa is concerned with browserless browsing.

For reason above, Tanigawa discloses a method for browsing the Web on the Internet, comprising using a browserless broadcast system.

Applicant further argues Tanigawa fails teach a step of “establishing an association between a link provided to the video data and a position of a cursor in the video data transmitted to the video display device” (page 15, lines 18-21).

In response, this argument is respectfully traversed. Tanigawa discloses the data generating unit 112 calculates the X-Y coordinates which express the display position of the cursor design, providing the X-Y coordinates to the receiving device; the control unit interprets the link information and generates a cursor design correspondence table in which cursor designs. These cursor designs are expressed by cursor information which is held inside the control unit. The control unit outputs design information expressing a cursor design together with the cursor position to the reproducing unit ... When the cursor is moved to a position on the display and click, data associated with the selected link are provided (see include, but are not limited to, figures 18a-21, col. 23, lines 30-37,

col. 24, line 46-col. 25, line 18, col. 26, lines 17-52, col. 27, lines 20-57, col. 29, line 1-col. 30, line 8). Thus, an associated link between a link provided to the video data and a position of a cursor in the video data transmitted to the video display device is established so that the cursor is displayed and associated with the link.

In response to Applicant's argument "Tanigawa doesn't allude to video data includes "audio data when said web page includes voice or sound", the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Claim 5 recites video data includes audio data when said web page includes voice or sound. Tanigawa disclose this limitation as discussed in page 6 of the final office Action, dated 02/14/2007.

In response to Applicant's argument a review of Tanigawa fails to show that claims 13-15, 19-20 are made obvious by Tanigawa (page 18, line 27-page 19, line 10), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner provides Karlton et al. (US 5,835,717 – see the claims), Bruck et al. (US 6,008,836 – see the claims), or Aggarwal et al. (US 6,360,227 – see claims) as just few examples to support that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embody the procedures of a method in a "computer readable medium" or program storage device readable by machine" or "computer program product" in order that the instructions could be automatically performed by a processor.

Art Unit: 2623

For the reasons given above, rejections on claims 1-20 are maintained as discussed in the Final Office Action, dated 02/14/2007.

/AH/